

Notes concerning Khawājah Muḥammad Muqīm Harawī, the father of Nizāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad Bakhshī.—By ANNETTE S. BEVERIDGE
(Communicated by the PHILOLOGICAL SECRETARY).

[Read, March 1895.]

As everything relating to the author of the *Ṭabaqāt* possesses interest, I venture to ask permission to “hang up” in the critical air of the *Journal* of the Asiatic Society of Bengal,—for confirmation or disproof,—a suggestion about the record of his father’s life which, if verified, will be of use in a second edition of Mr. Blochmann’s *Āin*.

It appears to me that *there is good ground for believing* “*Khawājah Muqīm, the son of Mīrakī*” (525, No. 401), *to be the father of Nizāmu-d-dīn, Khawājah Muḥammad Muqīm Harawī.*¹

The considerations which seem to me to support my suggestion are as follows:—

(a) Mr. Blochmann, basing his statement on the *Akbarnāmah*, says that *Khawājah Muqīm* (No. 401), the son of *Mīrakī*, was made a *bakhshī* in 999 H.

Abū-l-faḥl names *Muqīm* of *Khurāsān* in his list of *bakhshīs* (528), and Mr. Blochmann identifies this man with the “son of *Mīrakī*” by prefixing “No. 401” to his name, in this list.

Nizāmu-d-dīn says when speaking of the appointment of the *bakhshī* of 999 H. (*Ṭabaqāt*, Lakhnau ed., 374) “They appointed *Khawājah Mu. Muqīm*, an old family servant and who had been brought up in this Court, (*khānazād*) to the office of *bakhshī* of the army.”

Of all the *Muqīms* of this period, there is mentioned in the various sources—so far as I have been able to trace—one man only who answers to the description given by Abū-l-faḥl and *Nizāmu-d-dīn Aḥmad* of the *bakhshī* of 999 H., as being at once, a *Khurāsānī*, an old servant,

¹ All page references are to Mr. Blochmann’s *Āin* unless otherwise assigned.

For all the many references to the Persian which these notes have required. I am indebted to Mr. Beveridge, as well as for counsel, and the multiform help which comes from discussion of “points.” For all errors, I only am responsible.

a *khānazād*, and as bearing the names Muḥammad Muqīm and the title *Khwājah*. This is the father of Nizām,—*Khwājah Mu. Muqīm Harawī*.¹

The various Muqīms of this time are as follows :—

1. Shujā'at *Khān*, Muqīm-i-'Arab. A Turkistānī, and died in 988 H.
2. Muqīm *Khān*, son of Shujā'at *Khān*. A Turkistānī and, early under Akbar, a Commander of 500.
3. Mīrzā Mu. Muqīm, the son of Mīrzā Zalnūn, and by marriage a cousin of the Emperor Bābar.
4. Muqīm Naqshbandī. Defeated and slain in Gujrāt, in 983 H.
5. Muqīm a "Commander of Five Hundred, 100 horse;"—a relation of Āṣaf *Khān* III. Ja'far Bēg Qazwīnī (413), (*Pādīshāhnāmah*, I, part 2, 328). The word which Mr. Blochmann renders "relation" is *khwēsh*. I can find nothing to decide whether Muqīm was a blood-relation and therefore perhaps a Qazwīnī, or a son-in-law of Ja'far Bēg. So that on the ground of descent there is, so far, nothing to prevent him from being No. 401. He is called *Shāhjāhānī* in Mr. Blochmann's index. If this implies that his best days were lived under *Shāhjāhān*, it makes, to some slight extent, against his being the *bakhshī* of 999 H., the said *bakhshī* being an old servant in 999 H. and the year of *Shāhjāhān*'s accession being 1037 H. Very little, however, can be built on the consideration that No. 401 would have been an old man in 1037 H., for some of the *amīrs* of these days rivalled modern statesmen in their sustained capacity for holding office. Perhaps some student of the sources for *Shāhjāhān*'s reign could tell something about this Muqīm.
6. *Khwājah Muḥammad Muqīm Harawī* (420, 421). A Khurāsānī, a servant of Bābar, Humāyūn and Akbar;—and possibly a *khānazād*²—at any rate young in the service of Bābar.
7. *Khwājah Muḥammad Muqīm*, the son of Mīrakī (525, No. 401). A Khurāsānī, an old servant of the State in 999 H.—and a *khānazād*. He was a Commander of Two Hundred.

(b) To entitle Muqīm *Bakhshī* to be called an old servant of the State in 999 H., he must have been a contemporary of Harawī for, at the least, the greater part of the 36 years of Akbar's reign antecedent to his appointment. If my suggestion that the Harawī of the earlier chronicling is the Muqīm *Bakhshī* of later record, be wrong, some curious coincidences must be faced. Both these men (supposing they were two), were Khurāsānīs;—Muqīm *Bakhshī* was a *khānazād*, Harawī was a dependent of Bābar (Elliot V, 178) if not literally a *khānazād*;—both bore the names Muḥammad Muqīm and the title *Khwājah*.³

¹ Harāt was until recently, the capital of Khurāsān. (Gazetteer of India.)

² The grounds for this are briefly indicated later on, in these notes (para. (f).)

³ Mīr Ma'ṣūm of Bhakkar calls Muqīm *Bakhshī* indifferently *Khwājah* and *Khān*, but I cannot find that the latter rank was ever bestowed on him. He seems to have ended his career as a leader of Two Hundred.

Their records do not overlap and they never appear on the scene together. Harawī vanishes from the record in 981 H., Mīrakī appears in 988 H. Moreover—and this is certainly a consideration of much weight—both men filled similar or identical offices. Harawī was a *dīwān*, a *vazīr*, an *amīn*: the son of Mīrakī an *amīn*, a *wāqī'ah nawīs*, a *bakhshī* and a *dīwān*. That there should have been two contemporaries, so alike in circumstance and whose character and rank fitted them to fill the same class of appointments would certainly be singular.

(c) Two questions present themselves which contribute something in favour of my suggestion. The record of the “old servant,” Muqīm *Bakhshī* begins in 998 H. What was his past?

The most important office named as filled by Harawī under Akbar was that of *amīn* in Sindh, in 981 H. What were the “high offices” which the *Maāshir* tells us, he held under Akbar? (Elliot V, 178. *Maāshir* under Muqīm’s name.)

(d) I have emphasized the fact that the two men bore the same names and title and it should now be noticed that more weight might be due to the conjunction of “Muḥammad” with “Muqīm,” if any other Muqīm of this time could be found bearing any other second name than Muḥammad! ‘Abū-l-faḍl names them all, short,—Muqīm;—Jahāngīr does the same; so too Bābar. Nizām¹ gives the Muḥammad to three—those to whom I have given it.

(e) It is a slight contribution in favour of my suggestion, perhaps, that the index to the *Akbarnāmah* (Bib. Ind.) places all the incidents which concern both Harawī and the “son of Mīrakī,” under the heading, “Muqīm *Bakhshī*.” The maker of the index must have possessed some guiding clue for this arrangement, as well as for the omission under this heading, of scattered incidents which concern other Muqīms.

(f) A lengthened search has yielded no information about the Mīrakī who is set down as the father of Muqīm *Bakhshī* (525).²

Possibly the word *Mīrakī* may not be a name, but may imply that Muqīm’s father held a petty office. If so, this would give fuller meaning to the epithet “*khānazād*” applied to the *Bakhshī* by Nizām and might indicate that like Nizām (who speaks of himself as a *khānazād*) the “son of *Mīrakī*” was born in the royal service. This would—granting the correctness of my suggestion,—explain how it was that Harawī entered Bābar’s service so young and was called a “dependent.”

¹ The passages in which he names his father in full are to be found in the *Tabaqāt* (Lakhnau ed. preface, and at page 374).

² The results of this search are published above, pp. 163 & ff.

If my suggestion survives examination, the biographical notice of No. 401 (525) should include, at least the following items:—

Khawājah Muḥammad Muqīm of *Khurāsān* (*Harawī*.) Son of *Kh.* *Mīrakī*. Descendant of the great saint of *Harāt*, *Kh.* ‘*Abdullah ‘Anṣarī* (*Ṭabaqāt*, Erskine’s MS., British Museum. Rieu’s Catalogue, 1,220). Brother-in-law of *Sultān Ibrāhīm Aubahī*. (435, 533.) Father of *Nizām-u-d-dīn Aḥmad*, the author of the *Ṭabaqāt*. Brought up in *Bābar*’s household;—employed in the *Dīwānī-i-buyūtāt* of *Bābar*;—instrumental in securing the succession to *Humāyūn* by repeating to *Mīr Khalīfah*, the threat uttered by *Mahdī Khawājah* against him, just before the death of *Bābar* (*Ṭabaqāt*, Lakhnau ed. 374);—*vazīr* to ‘*Askarī* in *Gujrāt* 941 H.;—at *Chaunṣā* with ‘*Askarī*, and one of the few troopers who escaped with *Humāyūn* to *Āgrā*, 946 H.;—at *Kanauj* with ‘*Askarī*, 947 H.;—*Nizām* born about 953 H.;—employed in “Government” business in *Āgrā*, 974 H. (Elliot V. 317)—an *amīn* near *Bhakkar* and counselling loyalty to the son of *Mīr Khalīfah*, *Muḥibb ‘Alī*, 981 H.;—with ‘*Azīz Kōkah* in *Bengal* 988 H.;—returns to Court with ‘*Azīz*, 991 H.;—in *Bengal* as *amīn* and *wāqī‘ah navīs* and shut up in *Ghōrāghaṭ* with *Ṭāhir Saifu-l-mulūk* 992 H. (*Abū-l-faḍl* speaks of him as a “jewel of sagacity and courage” at this point);—*bakhshī* to the armies of *Ṣadiq Khān Harawī* and *Ismā‘īl Qulī Khān* in *Multān*, 994 H.;—*bakhshī* to ‘*Abdu-r-rahīm Khān-khānān* in *Sindh*, 999 H.;—*dīwān* of *Multān* and commissioned to forward to Court the reports of his eleven colleagues—*dīwāns* of the Empire, 1003 H.;—death of *Nizām* 1003 H.*

The term of life necessary to cover the events recapitulated in this tentative biographical notice, is not beyond the bounds of probability and is far from being unexampled amongst the contemporaries of *Muqīm Bakhshī*. ‘*Azīz Kōkah* died at 84, having been made *atālīq* to Prince *Dāwar Bakhsh* when 83. *Mihtar Khān* lived to be 84 and died holding a Command of Three Thousand. *Mīrān Ṣadr Jahān Muftī* died in 1020 H., and was believed to be 120 years old. *Jahāngīr* promoted him to be a *Chahār-hazārī*, twenty years or thereabouts before his death. *Muḥibb ‘Alī* was a fighting man under *Bābar* and died in 989 H. *Peshrau Khān* was, according to *Jahāngīr*, an excellent servant and smarter than many a young man, at the age of 90.

* Elliot says (V. 178) that *Harawī* is spoken of in *Bābar*’s Memoirs. If so, his name has escaped a thrice-repeated search through the Memoirs. A *Muqīm* figures there frequently, but this is the son of *Mīrzā Zalnūn* and son-in-law of *Mīrzā Ulugh Bēg*, *Bābar*’s cousin. In a supplemental chapter (Memoirs of *Bābar*, 428) Mr. Erskine relates the story of *Mahdī Khawājah* and *Muqīm Harawī*. It is interesting to find that at the time he quoted the welcome passage, he did not know the *Ṭabaqāt*.

The first fixed date in Muqīm Harawī's life is *Jumāda* I. 974 H. (1530). Its last is 1003 H. (1594), a period of 64 years. Of the date of his death, I know nothing; Nizām rarely names his father, as such, and does not chronicle his own joys and sorrows, so that nothing certain can be gathered from his silence.

There are indications—too slight to carry weight without a long criticism of the story of Mahdī Khwājah's threat against Mir Khalifah—which point to Harawī's being a young man at the time it concerns, *viz.* 974H. If the story had been written down in or near 974 H., there must have been set against these indications of youth, those of adult wisdom contained in the advice offered by Harawī when he reported to Mir Khalifah the threat against him which he had overheard from the mouth of the Khwājah. But the record is of much later date, and was made when Harawī and Nizām were both grave men. Possibly the wisdom is a reflection of maturer years; it was certainly not needed as an argument against Mahdī's succession by the man he threatened and in whose power it lay to raise him to the throne or—as was done—to pass him by. One doubts too, if any *dīwān-i-buyūtāt*—whatever the number of his years—would have ventured to argue with the “pillar of Bābar's Empire” as to anything he had proposed to himself to do, but even the youngest servant might have reported a speech which betokened treachery to one of his master, Bābar's, most trusted adherents.

Summing up the points as to Muqīm Harawī's age, it seems to me that if he did not long survive 1003 H. and was a young man in 974 H. his whole career may well have been one of under ninety years.

